



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*mf*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/791,724	01/29/97	PRYOR	R S87.506/SD59

SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES  
PATENT AND LICENSING CENTER  
P O BOX 5800 MS 0161  
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87185-0161

LM02/0707

EXAMINER

KEMPER, M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2764

DATE MAILED:

07/07/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/791729

Applicant(s)

Pryor et al.

Examiner

Kempu

Group Art Unit

2764

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/22/99
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) ~~1-8~~ 1-8, 10-19 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) 18-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-17 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
  - ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2764

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-8, 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 does not claim either pre-computer process activity or post-computer process activity or a practical application in the technological arts. For that matter, claim 1 is not considered part of the technological arts. Without falling into one of these categories, the claim is not considered statutory. For instance, the preamble merely sets forth the intended use or field of use of predicting a change in the economy and does not set forth a practical application in the technological arts. The steps of the claim relating to representing decision makers, initializing the internal state of each agent, and generating and routing messages are considered to be necessary antecedent steps to performance of the mathematical operation or determination of new values. Also, the outputting a representation of the change merely conveys the result of the operation.

While claim 2 does introduce the method into the technological arts, the claim still does not provide pre- or post- computer process activity or a practical application. The remainder of the dependent claims also do not provide pre- or post- computer process activity or a practical application but rather describe the mathematical process or determination or description of the input necessary for the determination.

Art Unit: 2764

Similarly, claim 10 is within the technological arts, but does not provide pre- or post-computer process activity or a practical application for predicting a change in an economy. Without falling into one of these categories, the claim is not considered statutory. For instance, the preamble merely sets forth the intended use or field of use of predicting a change in the economy and does not set forth a practical application in the technological arts. The steps of the claim relating to representing decision makers, initializing the internal state of each agent, and generating and routing messages are considered to be necessary antecedent steps to performance of the mathematical operation or determination of new values. Also, the outputting a representation of the change merely conveys the result of the operation. Similarly the dependent claims also do not provide pre- or post-computer process activity or a practical application but rather describe the mathematical process or determination or description of the input necessary for the determination.

The hardware elements of claims 16-17 are directed to a general purpose computer as described in the specification. No specific code or programming and/or no specific hardware is included to constitute a specific machine. Therefore, the underlying process is examined and is determined to be non-statutory since the process does not include pre- or post-processing steps such as a direct measurement (as made by using sensors) or a control step based upon the result. Also, the claims are not limited to a practical application since the output, or result, is not used in any practical manner or application. The claims messaging amounts to input/output necessary for the processing operations of predicting a change in the economy.

Art Unit: 2764

3. Newly submitted claims 18-19 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The claims are directed to a military confrontation economy which does not include the same agents as the originally presented economic prediction and performs simulating battlefield communications and selecting campaign strategies not related to the originally presented claims.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 18-19 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 4/22/99 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the present claims are directed to a practical application in the technological arts. However, practical application refers to how the process or output is used in an application. In the present claims, the result is merely outputted with no use of the output associated therewith. The prediction of a change in an economy by processing a specific type of model does not represent a practical application. First, no specific type of model is disclosed or claimed (no specific rules are given in the specification) and second, the output is not used in any way. Likewise, the claims fail to reflect the practical utility in the technological arts. While the claims are directed to an economic system, the results of the simulation are not used in any way.

Art Unit: 2764

The applicant states that the invention can be applied to a hypothetical system to predict experimental outcomes by simulating complex interactions, decision rules, and options (however, these complex interactions or decision rules are not specified) which cannot be adequately described by closed-form analytic equations and which may have no historical data from which to apply traditional regression and forecasting techniques. However, in the specification, there is an example of using probabilities in the decision rules which clearly reflects a mathematical algorithm as part of the model or simulation. Alternatively, without other specific rules, a user could use any rule which would perform the function and which could comprise mere comparisons which is also considered mathematical (subtractions).

The applicant also argues that the claims are directed to using a specific machine. However, according to the specification the machine is a general purpose computer. Claims which are directed to a machine which comprises a general purpose computer are examined according to the underlying method which has been determined to be non-statutory as discussed above.

While the present invention may model a real thing, an economy, this is not enough to constitute statutory subject matter. For example consider claims which are directed to a process that calculates a mathematical algorithm modeling/simulating noise (a real thing/problem in signal analysis) would be considered non-statutory while a method for digitally filtering noise employing a mathematical algorithm would be considered statutory subject matter (performing a practical application).

Art Unit: 2764

The applicant argues that claim 1 is statutory because the claims are directed to a practical application and since the claims do not recite a mathematical algorithm. However, as discussed above, outputting a representation of the change in the economy (outputting a result, presumably a number) without use is not considered statutory. Also, the specification refers to calculating a probability which is mathematical. The claims do not have to directly recite a mathematical algorithm to be considered non-statutory if the process of performing a determination or modeling or simulation is mathematical as described in the specification. Also the use of multiple processors as in claim 2 does not bring the claims into the statutory realm since this refers to a general purpose computer as described in the specification. Claims including elements of a general purpose computer are examined according to the underlying process. Also, the claims are not considered to be a specific machine when a general purpose computer is used and when no specific code or program is disclosed. Also the routing of messages of claim 5 refers to input/output necessary for the processing steps and also do not constitute statutory subject matter. This input/output are also not directed to direct measurements by a sensor or control steps which would be considered statutory. Similar arguments are made concerning the remaining claims are unpersuasive for the reasons given above.

The applicant cites part of MPEP section 2106 IV B. 2 (a) in support of the claims being directed to a specific machine.

“ If a claim defines a useful machine or manufacture by identifying the physical structure

of the machine or manufacture in terms of its hardware or hardware and software combination, it defines a statutory product. See, e.g., Lowry, 32 F.3d at 1583, 32 USPQ2d at 1034-35; Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361-62, 31 USPQ2d at 1760.

Art Unit: 2764

A machine or manufacture claim may be one of two types: (1) a claim that encompasses any and every machine for performing the underlying process or any and every manufacture that can cause a computer to perform the underlying process, or (2) a claim that defines a specific machine or manufacture. When a claim is of the first type, Office personnel are to evaluate the underlying process the computer will perform in order to determine the patentability of the product.

I) Claims That Encompass Any Machine or Manufacture Embodiment of a Process

Office personnel must treat each claim as a whole. The mere fact that a hardware element is recited in a claim does not necessarily limit the claim to a specific machine or manufacture. Cf. *In re Iwahashi*, 888 F.2d 1370, 1374-75, 12 USPQ2d 1908, 1911-12 (Fed. Cir. 1989), cited with approval in *Alappat*, 33 F.3d at 1544 n.24, 31 USPQ2d at 1558 n.24. If a product claim encompasses any and every computer implementation of a process, when read in light of the specification, it should be examined on the basis of the underlying process. Such a claim can be recognized as it will:

(A) define the physical characteristics of a computer or computer component exclusively as functions or steps to be performed on or by a computer, and

(B) encompass any and every product in the stated class (e.g., computer, computer-readable memory) configured in any manner to perform that process.”

However, as the specification states, a general purpose computer (any machine) is used.

According to the guidelines, the underlying process is examined and has been determined to be non-statutory.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period



Art Unit: 2764

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

**6. Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

(703) 308-5357 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.,  
Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Kemper, whose telephone number is 703-305-9589. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30-6:00. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jim Trammell, can be reached at 703-305-9768.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

M. Kemper  
July 2, 1999



M. Kemper  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2764